



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,412	02/27/2004	Bernd Klotz	KLOTZ-3	5250

20151 7590 04/05/2010  
HENRY M FEIEREISEN, LLC  
HENRY M FEIEREISEN  
708 THIRD AVENUE  
SUITE 1501  
NEW YORK, NY 10017

EXAMINER
----------

HUSON, MONICA ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1791

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

04/05/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

INFO@FEIEREISENLLC.COM

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING  
2  
3 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
4

5  
6 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
7 AND INTERFERENCES  
8

9  
10 *Ex parte* BERND KLOTZ  
11

12  
13 Appeal No. 2009-013486  
14 Application No. 10/789,412  
15 Technology Center 1700  
16

17  
18 Oral Hearing Held: March 10, 2010  
19

20  
21 Before JEFFREY T. SMITH, LINDA M. GAUDETTE, and  
22 JEFFREY B. ROBERTSON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.  
23

24  
25 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:  
26

27 HENRY M. FEIEREISEN, ESQUIRE  
28 Henry M. Feiereisen, LLC  
29 708 Third Avenue  
30 Suite 1501  
31 New York, New York 10017  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

1 JUDGE SMITH: Good morning.

2 MR. FEIEREISEN: Good morning. My name is Henry Feiereisen. I'm  
3 calling regarding Appeal Number 2009-013486.

4 JUDGE SMITH: You've reached a hearing room at the Board. Today your  
5 panel is Linda Gaudette, Jeffrey Smith, and Jeffrey Robertson.

6 MR. FEIEREISEN: Okay.

7 JUDGE SMITH: We're the judges presiding over the hearing for today.

8 MR. FEIEREISEN: Okay.

9 JUDGE SMITH: The proceedings today are being transcribed. We have a  
10 transcriber here who is recording the proceedings, and that will be entered  
11 into the record.

12 MR. FEIEREISEN: So you will transfer the call into the Board?

13 JUDGE SMITH: You actually are in the hearing room.

14 MR. FEIEREISEN: Oh, I am in the hearing room. Okay. Good.  
15 So shall I start?

16 JUDGE SMITH: Could you spell your last name for the record.

17 MR. FEIEREISEN: Yes. My name is Henry Feiereisen, F-E-I-E-R-E-I-S-  
18 E-N.

19 JUDGE SMITH: Thank you. You have 20 minutes to present your  
20 arguments, and you can begin when you're ready.

21 MR. FEIEREISEN: I am ready.

22 JUDGE SMITH: Okay.

23 MR. FEIEREISEN: Good morning. The Examiner in this case effectively  
24 ignored a key feature of Claim 1 that is missing in Takeda and by itself  
25 renders the rejection under 102 untenable.

1 The missing feature is the reference in Claim 1 to a positive mold, which is  
2 an established term in the art, to relate to a compression mold designed to  
3 trap all of the molding materials and thus to prevent escape of molding  
4 material during a molding cycle.

5 This definition of a positive mold is expressly adopted in Paragraph 19 of  
6 the specification, which reads that the use of generally known positive molds  
7 is preferred because their structure avoids escape of material from the mold  
8 even when a half mold moves.

9 That the Examiner failed to recognize this claim limitation is evidenced also  
10 by her statement in the Final Rejection, under the heading response to  
11 arguments, where she contended that the fact that Takeda discloses a return  
12 of material is inapposite because Claim 1 does not exclude such an extra step  
13 when, in fact, it does.

14 The Examiner failed to properly define the scope of the present invention,  
15 notwithstanding her incorrect assertion that the Takeda reference also  
16 involves a method using a positive mold.

17 Takeda expressly describes a molding operation in which material from the  
18 cavity returns to the material supply device side.

19 To read one of several passages -- Column 9, for example, lines 21 to 24 --  
20 Takeda describes that excess resin inside the mold cavity returns to the  
21 runner through the still open gate, and/or flows out to the overflow portion  
22 so that the resin inside the mold assembly is returned to the cylinder body of  
23 the heated cylinder unit 1.

24 In other words, Takeda adjusts the amount of material in the cavity until the  
25 appropriate amount is contained in the cavity.

1 JUDGE SMITH: Excuse me, Mr. Feiereisen. Did you make this argument  
2 in your Brief?

3 MR. FEIEREISEN: I pressed these points, but I'm doing it from a different  
4 angle now. I mean, it was so clear to me that the positive mold that is in the  
5 claim language -- and I made that point on record before -- I just want to  
6 stress it in this argument in this hearing now because it is so clear that the  
7 positive mold is an established term; and it should be clear throughout the  
8 record.

9 JUDGE SMITH: You understand we are limited to the arguments that were  
10 presented in the Brief and that have been presented before the Examiner,  
11 don't you?

12 MR. FEIEREISEN: Yes, but those arguments were presented. That's why  
13 the Examiner in the Final Rejection referred to the point that we don't  
14 exclude that step that material can escape, and that's why Takeda reads on it.  
15 So that point was made.

16 I'm just pressing this point now from a little different angle to focus on the  
17 positive mold, but it's there.

18 Takeda adjusts the amount of material in the cavity until the appropriate  
19 amount is contained in the cavity, and in contrast thereto, Claim 1 sets for a  
20 complete filling of the cavity once the positive mold is closed, and adding  
21 additional material to expand the cavity to a size commensurate with a  
22 defined article thickness.

23 No material is returned or intended to escape. That point was made. It's on  
24 record.

1 Takeda differs also in other respects, which I'd briefly like to address here  
2 and which, again, in my view renders the rejection under 102 untenable.  
3 With respect to the step of fully filling the cavity with plastic material while  
4 maintaining a size of the cavity constant, as set forth in Claim 1, the  
5 Examiner interprets the reference too in this condition in Takeda to mean a  
6 closed cavity. This is pure speculation.

7 Takeda merely states in Column 8, Lines 4 - 20, that during the filling phase  
8 pressure equilibrium exists between the applied light clamping force, and the  
9 biasing force of the spring.

10 While pressure equilibrium exists, this is the situation that is referred to here.  
11 The cavity is filled. There is no reference here that the cavity remains  
12 constant during the filling step.

13 In fact, it can be assumed that the cavity does not remain constant because  
14 concurrent with the filling step is a pressure-adjusting step during which  
15 material is continued to be forced by the screw into the cavity.

16 Takeda expressly states in Column 9, Lines 43-45, that the volume of the  
17 cavity is not constant at the completion of the pressure-adjusting step.

18 Therefore, there is no reason to believe that the cavity remains constant  
19 during the filling phase, and the reference to "in this situation" does not  
20 imply anything to the contrary.

21 JUDGE ROBERTSON: Mr. Feiereisen, this is Judge Robertson. I wanted  
22 to ask you a question about that because in the second step in the claim, the  
23 distend step --

24 MR. FEIEREISEN: Yes.

1 JUDGE ROBERTSON: In that step you have additional amounts of resin.  
2 Does that expand the cavity at that point?

3 MR. FEIEREISEN: The second step or the third where it says adding  
4 plastic materials so as to distend?

5 JUDGE ROBERTSON: Yes.

6 MR. FEIEREISEN: Yes. You start, you fill it. The cavity remains  
7 constant, then you add material -- again, no material escapes. It just goes to  
8 the size or will expand to the size that eventually or ultimately is  
9 commensurate with the wall thickness to be produced.

10 That's also another point I'd like to make where I think the Examiner is also  
11 incorrect.

12 I'm coming to this adding step also right now because I think Takeda lacks  
13 that adding step as set forth in Claim 1.

14 JUDGE ROBERTSON: Mr. Feiereisen, why wouldn't the pressure-  
15 adjusting step in Takeda -- why couldn't that be interpreted as an adding  
16 plastic material step as in the distend step in your claim?

17 MR. FEIEREISEN: Because in Takeda you add material but it's never in  
18 order to make the defined -- which is also in that step -- to make the defined  
19 article thickness.

20 The process in Takeda is different. You just add material but eventually, in  
21 order to get the correct amount in the cavity, you have to inject or return  
22 material from the cavity.

23 We inject more material into the cavity until it's the right amount to produce  
24 a defined wall thickness.

25 In other words, what we're doing is we inject material into the cavity to

1 produce the proper wall thickness, while in Takeda the proper amount of  
2 wall material is attained by ejecting. By removing material from the cavity.

3 JUDGE ROBERTSON: Okay.

4 MR. FEIEREISEN: That's why the reference to define is relevant because  
5 we inject, again, until it's a defined wall thickness. That's not the case that is  
6 shown in Takeda.

7 JUDGE SMITH: Which portion of your claim are you referring to regarding  
8 the wall thickness?

9 MR. FEIEREISEN: Article thickness. It says in the third step, adding  
10 plastic material so as to distend the positive mold in opposition to the  
11 clamping force, until the cavity of the positive mold expands to reach a  
12 defined size for producing a defined article thickness. That inherently  
13 refers to the wall thickness.

14 That's not in Takeda. When they inject, the cavity does not remain constant.  
15 It becomes constant only after the measuring step or the compression step  
16 when the movable and stationary molds abut one another and the gate is  
17 closed.

18 That's when the product is produced.

19 So the whole process in Takeda is totally different.

20 JUDGE ROBERTSON: Can I ask you what happens in the next step when  
21 you close the positive mold until reaching a residual distending opening.

22 MR. FEIEREISEN: Yeah.

23 JUDGE ROBERTSON: What happens to the material then? Does it just get  
24 compressed? Does any of it come out?

25 MR. FEIEREISEN: Yes, it's going to be compressed, I think, in Figure 3.



1 From Figure 2 to Figure 3, that's the compression step.

2 JUDGE ROBERTSON: Okay.

3 MR. FEIEREISEN: But you still leave that opening to have some kind of  
4 floating support. That's why they retain that distending opening there.

5 JUDGE ROBERTSON: 15?

6 MR. FEIEREISEN: 15, exactly.

7 But the material is the same.

8 JUDGE ROBERTSON: Okay.

9 MR. FEIEREISEN: There is no escape. Again, that's what a positive mold  
10 is all about. From that point of view, I think you cannot compare those two  
11 processes.

12 May I continue?

13 JUDGE ROBERTSON: Yes.

14 MR. FEIEREISEN: With the defined wall thickness -- article thickness I  
15 just mentioned -- the Examiner made another assertion that is simply  
16 ignorant of what Claim 1 sets forth. That refers to the residual distending  
17 opening reached and the plastic article is produced.

18 In other words, the plastic article is produced in the presence of the residual  
19 distending opening. In Takeda the actual production of the product is  
20 realized when the movable plate and the base member abut one another.

21 Let me just summarize five points I think Takeda differs from the present  
22 invention. Again, in Takeda, material escapes from the cavity and, thus,  
23 there's no positive mold involved.

24 In Takeda, the cavity is not filled while remaining constant in size. There is  
25 no expansion of the cavity to the actual article thickness.

1 The compression is implemented from the size of the cavity, which is greater  
2 than the actual product size or wall thickness.

3 In Takeda, the mold is closed until the movable plate and the base member  
4 of the fixed mold abut together for realizing the compression stroke. There  
5 is no residual distending opening as set forth in Claim 1.

6 So I do believe that these two processes are so different from one another  
7 that the rejection should be reversed. Thank you.

8 JUDGE SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Feiereisen.

9 Do you have any questions?

10 JUDGE GAUDETTE: No.

11 JUDGE ROBERTSON: No further questions.

12 JUDGE SMITH: We have no further questions, and we want to thank you  
13 for calling in today for the hearing.

14 As I said, the transcript will become part of the record, and you will be able  
15 to get it once it does.

16 MR. FEIEREISEN: Let me also thank you. This is the first time after so  
17 many other appeals that I tried this over the phone, for allowing me to do  
18 that. It's not something -- I mean I hope this over the telephone is acceptable  
19 to you, but that needed to be done in this situation.

20 JUDGE SMITH: Okay.

21 MR. FEIEREISEN: Thank you very much.

22 Whereupon, the proceedings at 9:15 a.m. were concluded.

23

24

25